

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application in view of the amendments, herein, and the following remarks:

The following claims are *pending*: 1-14, 16.

The following claims are *independent*: 1, 5, 10, 13.

The following claims have previously been *cancelled* without prejudice or disclaimer: 15.

Please *add* new claim 16 and please *amend* claims 1, 5, 10, 13; although these claims have been amended herein to provide clarification, correct typographical inaccuracies and/or informalities, and/or to better track practical/commercial implementations/practices, Applicants submit that the originally filed claims are patentable and reserve the right to pursue the originally filed claims (as well as any claims dependent therefrom) at a later time and/or in one or more continuation/divisional application(s). Applicants submit that these new claims and/or claim amendments are supported throughout the originally filed specification and that no new matter has been added by way of these amendments. By way of non-limiting example only, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to p. 5, ¶ 1-2, p. 10, ¶ 2, and Figure 7 of the originally filed specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farnham et al., US Patent No. 7,167,910 (hereinafter "Farnham"), and in further view of Daniell, US Publication No. 2004/0158611 (hereinafter "Daniell"). It should be noted that Farnham was filed June 4, 2002, which is less than ten months earlier than Applicants' earliest priority date of March 14, 2003

and it is not conceded that Farnham was filed in the US before the invention by the Applicants. It should also be noted that Daniell was filed February 10, 2003, which is less than five weeks earlier than Applicants' earliest priority date of March 14, 2003 and it is not conceded that Daniell was filed in the US before the invention by the Applicants. Without so conceding, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and submit that a *prima facie* showing of obviousness has not been made and that the applied references, taken alone or in combination, fail to discuss or render obvious every element of each pending claim.

MPEP § 706.02(j) prescribes that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should set forth:

(A) the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s) where appropriate;

(B) the difference or differences in the claim over the applied reference(s);

(C) the proposed modification of the applied reference(s) to arrive at the claimed subject matter; and

(D) an explanation as to why the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. (MPEP § 706.02(j))

Applicant submits that the rejections in the pending Office Action do not establish each of these requirements.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

"A computer-implemented method for managing risk through link analysis mapping, the method comprising:

receiving, into a memory of a computer system, information descriptive of two or more persons and a plurality of association types;

generating, in the computer system, links associating two or more persons based upon the received information, wherein the links indicate a relationship between the two or more persons and an association type;

..."

Applicant submits that the applied references, taken alone or in combination, do not discuss or render obvious at least these elements recited in independent claim 1.

The pending rejection alleges,

"Farnham teaches a system and a method comprising: receiving, into memory of a computer system, information descriptive of two or more persons (Figure 2, step 202); generating, in the computer system, links associating two or more persons based upon the received information, wherein the links indicate a relationship between the two or more persons (Figure 4, wherein links connect individuals and Figure 2, step 212);..."
(See, June 15, 2009 Office Action, pages 2-3).

Applicants disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the cited reference.

Instead, Farnham discusses similarity maps constructed based on email communication associations between people. Specifically, Farnham discloses "computer communication information is analyzed to determine extents of similarity between the multiple contacts," (Farnham, Abstract, lines 15-16), based on "identifiers of who sent and was sent email messages, as indicated in email headers," (Farnham, column 4, lines 21-22). Using the email header information Farnham "cluster[s] contacts into groups," (Farnham, Figure 2, step 208) by means of a similarity measure associated with email parameters (e.g. sender and receiver data). Farnham elaborates, "with regard to an implementation based upon email messages, for example, the similarity between two people may be defined as the number of email messages on which they co-occur," (Farnham, column 5, lines 30-33). However, Applicants submit that Farnham's similarity measure between two people based on "the number of email messages on which they co-occur," is different from the claimed "receiving, into a memory of a computer system, information descriptive of two or more persons and a plurality of association types," much less the claimed "generating, in the computer system, links associating two or more persons

based upon the received information, wherein the links indicate a relationship between the two or more persons and an association type...,” as recited in amended independent claim 1.

The MPEP prescribes that, “when evaluating the scope of a claim, *every limitation in the claim must be considered*,” [§ 2106 II(C), emphasis added] and, “*All words* in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” [§ 2143.03, emphasis added]. Applicants submit that the pending rejection has failed to consider “every limitation in the claim” and “[a]ll words in [the] claim” in judging the patentability of the claim against the prior art by mischaracterizing claim elements and/or over-generalizing the applied reference(s). Accordingly, Applicants submit that a *prima facie* showing of obviousness has not been put forth and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this basis of rejection.

Although of different scope than claim 1, Applicants submit that claims 5, 10 and 13 are patentable over Farnham in view of Daniell, taken alone or in combination, for at least similar reasons as discussed above identifying deficiencies in the applied references with regard to independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this basis of rejection.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-12, 14, and new claim 16, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 5, 10 and 13, are also not discussed or rendered obvious by the cited references, taken alone or in combination, for at least the reasons discussed above identifying deficiencies in the applied references with regard to the independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this basis of rejection.

CONCLUSION

Consequently, the reference(s) cited by the office action do not result in the claimed invention, there was/is no motivation, basis and/or rationale for such a combination of references (i.e., cited references do not teach, read on, suggest, or result in the claimed invention(s)), and the claimed inventions are not admitted to be prior art. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that the supporting remarks and claimed inventions, claims 1-14, 16, all: overcome all rejections and/or objections as noted in the office action, are patentable over and discriminated from the cited reference(s), and are in a condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants believe that the above remarks, which distinguish the claims over the cited reference(s), pertained only to noted claim element portions. These remarks are believed to be sufficient to overcome the prior art. While many other claim elements and/or bases for rejection were not discussed as they have been rendered moot based on the above amendments and/or remarks, Applicants assert that all such remaining and not discussed claim elements and/or bases for rejection, all, also are distinguished over the prior art and reserve the opportunity to more particularly traverse, remark and distinguish over any such remaining claim elements and/or bases for rejection at a later time, should it become necessary. Further, any remarks that were made in response to an Office Action objection and/or rejection as to any one claim element, and which may have been re-asserted as applying to another Office Action objection and/or rejection as to any other claim element(s), any such re-assertion of remarks is not meant to imply that there is commonality about the structure, functionality, means, operation, and/or scope of any of the claim elements, and no such commonality is admitted as a consequence of any such re-assertion of remarks. As such, Applicants do not concede that any claim elements have been anticipated and/or rendered obvious by any of the cited reference(s). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection(s) and/or objection(s), and allowance of all claims.

Authorization

Applicant hereby authorizes and requests that the Commissioner charge any additional fees that may be required for consideration of this and/or any accompanying and/or necessary papers to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17209-310. In the event that an extension of time is required (or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time), Applicant requests that the Commissioner grant a petition for an extension of time required to make this response timely, and, Applicant hereby authorizes and requests that the Commissioner charge any fee or credit any overpayment for such an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17209-310.

In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate examination of the application in any way, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,
CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP

Dated: December 15, 2009

By: Daniel C. Sheridan/

Daniel C. Sheridan
Registration No.: 53,585

Correspondence Address:

CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112

212-408-5100 (Telephone)
212-541-5369 (Facsimile)
patents@chadbourne.com (E-mail)